

From: [Dave Dickerson](#)
To: [Rigassio-Smith, Anita](#)
Subject: RE: Draft Alternative #4 2-Cell at \$80M/YR
Date: 06/04/2009 04:08 PM
For Follow Up: Normal Priority.
Attachments: Vol & Disp Assump_Apex Alt 1_2Cellrev3.xls

Interesting, you can tell I only skimmed the table.

Has anyone checked the assumption that all 225k cy of bottom of UHCC material can be used to cap the LHCC? I suppose if the LHCC can NOT accept this much volume as a cap, we could use the bottom of UHCC material for "mudflat restoration/capping after dredging" in the UH.

thanks - Dave

▼ "Rigassio-Smith, Anita" <Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com>

"Rigassio-Smith, Anita"
<Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com>

To Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
cc

06/04/2009 03:40 PM

Subject RE: Draft Alternative #4 2-Cell at \$80M/YR

Hi Dave,

Because we are using the glaciofluvial material from the UHCC to cap the LHCC the removal effort is included in the capping of LHCC task. For the LHCC cap task we assumed hydraulically dredging the material from the UHCC and depositing it as a cap over the LHCC. I put a description near the top of page 3.

I am attaching the spreadsheet that shows the distribution of various materials. The UHCC organics are 51,429 cy because the capacity of the UHCC needs to be only 225,252 cy.

Anita

-----Original Message-----

From: dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 04, 2009 2:56 PM
To: Rigassio-Smith, Anita
Subject: Re: Draft Alternative #4 2-Cell at \$80M/YR

thanks Anita - I look forward to reviewing this. One thing that jumps out at me initially though is that I don't see removal of the UHCC except for the 51,429 cy of organics...did I miss something??

Dave

Smith,
Anita"
To
"Rigassio-
<Anita.Rigassio-

Smith@jacobs.com Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA,
 > ElaineT
 Stanley/R1/USEPA/US@EPA,
 <K.C.Mitkevicius@nae02.usace.army
 06/04/2009 02:00 .mil>, "L'Heureux, Paul G
 NAE"
 PM
 <Paul.G.L'Heureux@usace.army.mil>
 cc
 \"(Boston)\",
 <Michael.Anderson@jacobs.com>,
 Jackie"
 "Fox,
 Bedford\"
 <Steve.Fox@jacobs.com>,
 Anita"
 Smith@jacobs.com>
 New
 Bedford"
 NewBedfor
 d@jacobs.com>
 Subject
 at
 \$80M/YR

"Anderson, Michael
 "Connor,
 <Jackie.Connor@jacobs.com>,
 Steve \"(New
 "Rigassio-Smith,
 <Anita.Rigassio-
 , "Document Control - Bourne-
 <DocumentControl-Bourne-
 Draft Alternative #4 2-Cell

Please find attached the draft cost estimate for Alternative #4
 2-CAD-Cell scenario at \$80M/year. Comments on the previous hybrid and
 T&D cost estimates have been incorporated into this cost estimate, as
 applicable, which have not yet been reflected in the hybrid and T&D
 estimates. Therefore, the three scenarios are similar but not
 entirely
 comparable at this stage. The three cost estimates will be revised
 with
 consistent assumptions for the ESD. Please let us know if you need
 revised cost estimates prior to the ESD estimates.

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged
 information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any
 viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by
 unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received
 this
 message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the
 message and deleting it from your computer.[attachment "Alt 4 2Cell
 80M

Transmittal.pdf" deleted by Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US] [attachment
"Alt
4 Two Cell 80M Draft.pdf" deleted by Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US]

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.



Vol & Disp Assump_Apex Alt 1_2Cellrev3.xls